Remarks

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Claims 1-23 and 25-41 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1-23 and 25; cancelled claim 24; and added new claims 26-41. Of the pending claims, claims 1, 13, 25-26, 30, and 35 are the only independent claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action mailed March 23, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9, 13-17, 20-21, and 24-25 (which includes independent claims 1, 13, and 25) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,970,505 issued to Ebrahim ("Ebrahim").

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to more clearly define over Ebrahim. The Applicant has written newly added independent claims 26, 30, and 35 to define over Ebrahim.

1. **Background of the Claimed Invention**

As set forth in the Background Art section of the Applicant's specification, information available on web sites on the World Wide Web, e.g., the Internet, have become an indispensable source for research. However, web based information is not merely an electronic version of a physical publication (such as books, newspapers, magazines, etc.) but is rather a standalone medium with no physical equivalents.

Authors are now citing information from web sites in their manuscripts. In the bibliography section of the manuscript, authors generally include three pieces of information when citing web sites: 1) the address of the web site (i.e., a uniform resource locator (URL)

such as www.website.com; 2) date the author accessed the web site; and 3) the last modified date of the web site. A problem with citing web sites as sources of information is that 1) web sites are subject to frequent, invisible modification; and 2) web sites may be moved to a new address or removed from the Internet without notice.

An important reason for citing reference material from any source such as the Internet and traditional published material is to enable verification of the reference material. The problem with citing a web site is that the fluid, ever modifiable potential of the content of the web site does not guarantee availability and true verification of the web site material used by the author.

As further evidence of the problem with citing web sites, the Applicant has submitted herewith a copy the article entitled "Here Today, Gone Tomorrow: Studying How Online Footnotes Vanish" by Carlson, http://chronicle.com, April 2004. The article describes the problem associated with "the half-life of Internet footnotes" and how this problem arises from "the typical length of time it takes for half of the Web addresses in a scholarly article to become outdated, broken, or changed." A study described in the article noted that the half life of links to web sites was just over a year. The article notes that it is a goal to allow "the Web and Internet-related topics [to be] investigated with the same reliability that one would find in the library."

As such, what is needed is a method and system which enable an audience of a manuscript, which may be reading the manuscript years after the manuscript has been written by the author, to obtain an exact copy of the web sites cited by the author in the manuscript at the time the author wrote the manuscript. The claimed invention satisfies this need.

2.   The Claimed Invention

a.   Overview of the Claimed Invention

The claimed invention, as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 13 and newly added independent claims 26, 30, and 35, is generally directed to a method and system for archiving web sites cited in a manuscript by an author of the manuscript. As indicated above, web sites are updated frequently and thus cannot guarantee availability/true verification of material from the web sites actually cited by the author.

In order to guarantee availability/true verification of web sites actually cited by the author, the claimed invention generally as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 13 and newly added independent claims 26, 30, and 35 incorporates two qualities:

1.   The author is able to deposit a copy of the actual web site being cited by the author in a repository such as a database. In other words, the person (i.e., the author) who is depositing the copy of the web site into the database is not the original author of the web site. Further, the ability to deposit such web sites must not be limited to any select group of authors.

2.   The copy of the web site deposited in the database is immutable over time because if the web site has been updated after the copy of the web site has deposited into the database then the updated web site and the web site actually cited by the author will no longer be identical.

As indicated below, the claimed invention as recited in amended independent claim 25 also incorporates these two qualities but provides for a more generalized approach regarding reference material cited in the manuscript and takes into consideration whether the cited reference material is available or not yet available to the audience of the manuscript.

-18-

b.   Amended Independent Claims 1 and 13

The claimed invention, as set forth in amended independent claim 1, is a system for archiving reference material cited in a bibliography of a manuscript. Amended independent claim 13 recites an associated method.

The system includes first and second communications devices connected to the Internet and a database connected to the Internet. An author of a manuscript uses the first communications device to transfer identification of reference material cited by the author in the bibliography of the manuscript to the Internet. The cited reference material includes a web site and the identification includes identification of the web site.

The database receives a copy of the web site from the Internet in response to the author transferring the web site identification to the Internet such that the copy of the web site received by the database is verbatim to the web site as on the Internet at the time the author transferred the web site identification to the Internet. The database stores the copy of the web site. The database transfers a copy of the stored copy of the web site to an audience of the manuscript via the Internet and the second communications device in response to receiving a request from the audience for a copy of the web site whereby the copy of the web site received by the audience is verbatim to the web site as on the Internet at the time the author transferred the web site identification to the Internet.

c.   Amended Independent Claim 25

The claimed invention, as recited in amended independent claim 25, is a system for storing a reference material using a communications network. The system includes first and second communications device connected to the communications network and a database connected to the communications network. An author of a manuscript uses the first communications device to transfer a copy of reference material and reference material availability information to the communications network. An audience of the manuscript uses

the second communications device to request and receive a copy of the reference material and the reference material availability information from the communications network.

The database receives a copy of the reference material and the reference material availability information from the author. The database stores an immutable copy of the reference material and the reference material availability information and a distinctive key associated with the copy of the reference material and the reference material availability information. If the reference material is available, the database transmits a copy of the reference material to the audience in response to receiving a request from the audience for a copy of the reference material. If the reference material is not available, the database transmits a copy of the reference material availability information to the audience in response to receiving a request from the audience for a copy of the reference material.

d. Newly Added Independent Claims 26 and 30

The claimed invention, as recited in newly added independent claim 26, is a system for archiving a web site cited in a manuscript by an author of the manuscript. Newly added independent claim 30 recites an associated method. Newly added independent claims 26 and 30 generally resemble amended independent claims 1 and 13.

The method set forth in newly added independent claim 30 includes transferring web site identification from an author of a manuscript to the world wide web. The web site identification identifies a web cite cited in the manuscript by the author. A copy of the web site is transferred from the web to a database in response to the author transferring the web site identification to the web such that the copy of the web site transferred to the database is verbatim to the web site as on the web at the time the author transferred the web site identification to the web. The copy of the web site is stored in the database. A copy of the stored copy of the web site is then transferred from the database to the audience via the web in response to a request from the audience for a copy of the web site.

e.   Newly Added Independent Claim 35

The claimed invention, as recited in newly added independent claim 35, is a method for archiving information cited in a manuscript. Newly added independent claim 35 generally resembles amended independent claim 13 and newly added independent claim 30.

The method set forth in newly added independent claim 35 includes citing a web site in a manuscript. Prior to any modifications to the web site after the web site has been cited in the manuscript, a web site address is transferred to a database via the Internet. The web site address identifies the address of the web site on the Internet.

A copy of the web site is then provided from the Internet to the database in response to the web site address being transferred to the database such that the copy of the web site provided to the database is verbatim to the web site as on the Internet at the time the web site was cited in the manuscript. The copy of the web site is stored in the database. A copy of the stored copy of the web site is transferred from the database to an audience of the manuscript via the Internet in response to a request from the audience for a copy of the web site such that the copy of the web site transferred to the audience is verbatim to the web site as on the Internet at the time the web site was cited in the manuscript.

3.   The Claimed Invention Compared to Ebrahim

Ebrahim teaches a method to provide enhanced co-operation between a defined (limited) set of authors involved in a writing project/books etc., where the original author of a first document creates a tag and submits information about the document to a repository to help other authors of the book to access, search, and pick out information from this repository which is useful for their section of the book. This is done to avoid repetition of common data and by incorporating the tag - to also reflect the most current/updated information at all places where the tag has been imported.

In other words, for an author to use information for the book section under his authorship, a document must have already been tagged and deposited into the repository by the original author himself, in the absence of which the entire process described by Ebrahim abjectly fails. Other authors can only access, search, and pick information they might find useful for their book section. Moreover, <u>Ebrahim teaches that a given document submitted to the repository would be updated to contain the most recent information</u>. These two facts re-emphasize the nature and intended use of Ebrahim's invention i.e., for a defined (limited) number of authors to increase collaboration among them and thereafter for any material used by a second author to reflect the most updated information.

The following are illustrative examples of Ebrahim:

a.   **Examples that Show Disregard for the 1st Quality:**

As indicated above, the 1st quality incorporated by the claimed invention is that the author depositing the reference material such as a web site in the database is not the original author of the web site.

Ebrahim teaches a method for linking data in a document set including a plurality of books written by different groups of authors. The first step involves a first author of a first book tagging an information unit (iunit) in that book with a tag (see col. 2, lines 4-8). The first author then exports the tag to a tag repository that is accessible to all groups of authors. A second author of a second book can then access the tag repository and select a tag whose corresponding information they would like to import into their book (see col. 2, lines 10-14). This demonstrates the limitations placed on the second author, i.e., the ability to merely search the information that has been submitted to the database by the creating first author.

Further, Ebrahim teaches the semantic information is preferably a meaningful description provided by the first author that is viewable and searchable in the tag repository

-22-

to enable an iunit of a desired semantic type to be selected for importation into the second book (see col. 2, lines 15-19). Ebrahim further teaches authors (214) can find and create links to information in other books (212) so that the common information need only be generated and maintained by the original set of authors 214 (see col. 4, lines 5-8). Ebrahim further teaches that, after tagging, the creating authors export the tagged iunits to a tag repository, from which other authors may then import the exported tags (see col. 4, lines 11-13). Ebrahim further teaches that authors 214 select from the repository iunits they wish to import into docunits 218 for their own books 212 (see col. 4, lines 17-18). Ebrahim further teaches that the author of the original docunit can then choose to export information about the "matrix switch" iunit along with any other tagged iunits (see col. 5, lines 14-16).

Ebrahim further teaches that other authors of other books that need to refer to the specific switch weight defined in the docunit can then locate that information easily (see col. 5, lines 17-19). Ebrahim further teaches enabling of a reference/tag to be created to a document element (e.g., "10 tons") that includes the necessary information to allow another author to find the element and to create a reference to it after the tag has been exported (see col. 5, lines 20-24). Ebrahim further teaches that until it has been exported to the global tag repository 256, the information in the tag database 236 cannot be referenced by the other authors 214 (see col. 6, lines 33-35).

b.   Examples that Show Disregard for the 2nd Quality

As indicated above, the 2nd quality incorporated by the claimed invention is that the copy of the reference material such as a web site deposited in the database is immutable over time because if the web site has been updated after the copy of the web site has deposited into the database then the updated web site and the web site actually cited by the author will no longer be identical.

Ebrahim teaches that whenever a docunit 218 is updated using the editor 220, the editor 220 executes a Tagmaker program that scans the docunit 218 and generates/updates

the tag database 236 (see col. 5, lines 28-30). Ebrahim further teaches that each time one of the authors 214 updates one of the docunits 218 in the book 212 the tag database 236 is updated by the TagMaker with link information for all of the exportable iunits 222 (see col. 7, lines 19-22). Ebrahim further teaches that anytime a user updates a docunit the editor 424 executes the TagMaker 426, which updates the local tag database 444 (see col. 8, line 37-39).

Further, the URL's mentioned by Ebrahim are essentially pointers. The following example illustrates this point. Ebrahim teaches that each Docdomain_URL points to a file that lists the URLs (Document_URLs) for each of the documents that compose that docdomain. Each Document_URL in turn points to a file that lists the URLs (Docunit_URLs) for each docunit in that document and each Docunit_URL points to a file that contains one Doctag_URL for each doctag in that docunit (see col. 9, lines 19-25).

4.   **Further Comparison Between the Claimed Invention and Ebrahim**

Mr. Talluri, the inventor of this patent application, has been involved in different capacities in the scholarly information and publishing chain as an author, organizer of academic conferences/seminars and also as a reviewer of research papers for reputed conferences/journals. The following example provided by Mr. Talluri further illustrates the differences between the claimed invention and Ebrahim.

Consider an inventor filing a patent application and in his search for prior art comes across useful information on a website. The patent applicant wishes to include this web site as a reference while filing the patent application. However, the patent applicant would never be able to guarantee that the exact same information (i.e., the exact same web site) that the inventor wishes to present to the Examiner would still be available when the Examiner accesses the particular website. (Of course this problem could be avoided by providing the Examiner with a hard copy of the web site per current patent office rules, but assume that such rules prohibit hard copies from being provided to the Examiner.)

-24-

Using Ebrahim's system, the particular website must already have been tagged and exported into a repository by the original creating author of that website for the patent applicant to even use this web site. However, even if this vital step is neglected and it is assumed that the patent applicant somehow incorporates the web site into his document, the tagged information used by the patent applicant would automatically be updated every time the actual website is updated by the website's author/webmaster. In contrast, with the claimed invention, the patent applicant may submit the web site to a repository (and may then obtain a distinctive key that refers to this web site). The patent applicant then provide this distinctive key while submitting the patent application. The Examiner would obtain the distinctive key mentioned by the patent applicant and successfully retrieve the exact same information that was referenced by the patent applicant.

Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the claimed invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25, and newly added independent claims 26, 30, and 35 is patentable over Ebrahim. Claims 2-12, 14-23, 27-29, 31-34, and 36-41 depend from one of the independent claims and include all of the limitations therein. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdraw of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Ebrahim.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 7-8, 10-12, 18-19, and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebrahim in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0152215 issued to Clark ("Clark"). These claims depend from one of the independent claims and include the limitations therein. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdraw of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In summary, claims 1-23 and 25, as amended, and newly added claims 26-41 meet the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

SRIKRISHNA TALLURI

By _____
James N. Kallis
Reg. No. 41,102
Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 10, 2004

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351

Enclosure: "Here Today, Gone Tomorrow: Studying How Online Footnotes Vanish" by Carlson, http://chronicle.com, April 2004.